

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FI | LING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/088,727 | 07/19/2002 | | Peter Knoll | 10191/2289 | 4483 |
| 26646 | 7590 | 10/05/2004 | | EXAM | INER |
| KENYON | & KENY | ON | | SEVER, AI | NDREW T |
| ONE BROA | DWAY | | | | |
| NEW YORK, NY 10004 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 2051 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| ¢ | |
|---|--|
| • | |

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/088,727 | KNOLL ET AL. | | | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Andrew T Sever | 2851 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 27 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if | | | | | | | |
| imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | | | |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| 7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 16-42. | Claim(s) rejected: <u>16-42</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | _ | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | JUDY NGUYEN | | | | | |
| | | PRIMARY EXAMINER | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not overcome the rejection. Applicant argues that Jost cannot be properly combined with Kleinschmidt to obtain the claimed invention. Applicant argues each reference individually which the office acknowledges alone neither reference meets all the limitations of the independent claims, however applicant is incorrect in the assertion that a projector utilizing a mirror is incapable of producing a real image (see page 8 of applicant's arguments as numbered by the applicant page 3 as numbered by the office), it is well known that certain curved mirrors produce real images when the image source and observer are at the proper locations (for example the popular physics demonstration of the coin floating above the concave mirror or for example US 4,348,187 which shows an aerial image (real image) being generated after reflecting off of several mirrors.) Given that Kleinschmidt teaches advantages to a real image display, given that Jost teaches advantages to projecting the image for a display from the ceiling of the vehicle, and given there are well known means such as using a curved reflector to achieve this; it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the two teachings. Accordingly applicant's arguments are not found persuasive.